

REMARKS:

Claims 1 to 8, 10, and 12 to 26 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 12, 21, 25 and 26 are the independent claims. No claims have been amended herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

All pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,026,448 (Goldrian), U.S. Patent No. 6,499,028 (Brock), and U.S. Patent No. 6,658,469 (Massa). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Discussion

Independent claim 1 recites the following:

1. A method, including steps of sending data between a client and a server using at least one of plural data buffers of different sizes both in said client and in said server, at least some of said data buffers both in said client and in said server matched to sizes of data blocks to be transferred into or out of those data buffers; herein said step of sending selects one or more of said data buffers for a data transfer responsive to a size of data blocks for said data transfer.

The applied art is not seen by Applicant to disclose or to suggest the features of this claim, at least with respect to "at least some of said data buffers both in said client and in said server matched to sizes of data blocks to be transferred into or out of those data buffers."

The first paragraph on page 4 of the Office Action acknowledges that neither Goldrian nor Brock teaches this feature. Massa was cited to remedy the deficiency of Goldrian's and Brock's teachings.

The Office Action on page 4 states that Massa teaches the following: "switch 120 determines if the size of the receive buffers 134 in the client is large enough, and if it is then switch 126 transfers an amount of data equal to the size of the receive buffers." To Applicant, this appears to imply that the data is matched to the receive buffer. Applicant respectfully submits that this is different from data buffers that are matched to the size of data blocks to be transferred. In fact, one advantage of having client and server data buffers matched to the size of data blocks to be transferred is that the data blocks do not need to be re-sized for efficient transfer between the buffers.

Furthermore, even if these features are equivalent, Applicant does not see anything in these teachings that is equivalent to "data buffers ... in said **server** matched to sizes of data blocks to be transferred," as is also recited by claim 1. While Massa certainly does teach the existence of send buffers, which the Examiner has equated with data buffers in a server, Applicant sees no mention of having these buffers matched to a size of data blocks.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 4 to 8 and 10: Claim 4 is reproduced here as amended:

4. A system including
a client and server;
a NUMA communication link coupled to said client and server; and
plural data buffers of different sizes both in said client and in said
server for data transfers between said client and said server using said NUMA

communication link, at least some of said data buffers both in said client and in said server matched to sizes of data blocks to be transferred into or out of those data buffers;

wherein one or more of said data buffers is selected for a data transfer responsive to a size of data blocks for said data transfer.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 4, at least with respect to “at least some of said data buffers both in said client and in said server matched to sizes of data blocks to be transferred into or out of those data buffers.” Substantially as discussed above with respect to claim 1, the applied art is not seen to teach this feature. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 4 and its dependent claims.

Claims 12 to 20: Claim 20 is reproduced here as amended:

12. A system including

a server, said server having a memory including a client communication region and a data transfer region, said data transfer region having plural data buffers of different sizes for data transfers to and from a client, at least some of said data buffers matched to different sizes of data blocks to be transferred into or out of those data buffers and matched to different sizes of data buffers in said client that are also matched to said different sizes of said data blocks to be transferred; and

a remote DMA communication link coupled to said data transfer region;

wherein said client communication region includes information regarding a data transfer into or out of said data transfer region; and

wherein one or more of said server data buffers is selected for a data transfer responsive to a size of data blocks for said data transfer.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 12, at least with respect to “at least some of said data buffers matched to different sizes of data blocks to be transferred into or out of those data buffers and matched to different sizes of data buffers in said

client that are also matched to said different sizes of said data blocks to be transferred.” While worded differently because this claim recites only the server side, this claim also necessitates that at least some of the data buffers both in the client and in the server are matched to sizes of data blocks to be transferred into or out of those data buffers. Substantially as discussed above with respect to claim 1, the applied art is not seen to teach this feature. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 20 and its dependent claims.

Claims 21 to 24: Claim 21 is reproduced here as amended:

21. A method including
communicating file system requests and responses between a client
and a file server;

sending data between said client and said file server using a memory
access operation involving at least one of plural data buffers of different sizes
both in said client and in said file server, at least some of said data buffers
both in said client and in said file server matched to sizes of data blocks to be
transferred into or out of said data buffers, wherein selection of one or more
of said data buffers is responsive to information in said requests or said
responses and is responsive to a size of data blocks for said memory access
operation.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 21,
at least with respect to “at least some of said data buffers both in said client and in said file server
matched to sizes of data blocks to be transferred into or out of said data buffers.” Substantially as
discussed above with respect to claim 1, the applied art is not seen to teach this feature. Therefore,
reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 21 and its
dependent claims.

Claim 25: Claim 25 is reproduced here as amended:

25. A method including

communicating file system requests and responses between a client and a database server;

sending data between said client and said database server using a memory access operation involving at least one of plural data buffers of different sizes both in said client and in said database server, at least some of said data buffers both in said client and in said database server matched to sizes of data blocks to be transferred into or out of said data buffers, wherein selection of one or more of said data buffers is responsive to information in said requests or said responses and is responsive to a size of data blocks for said memory access operation.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 25, at least with respect to “at least some of said data buffers both in said client and in said database server matched to sizes of data blocks to be transferred into or out of said data buffers.” Substantially as discussed above with respect to claim 1, the applied art is not seen to teach this feature. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 25.

Claim 26: Claim 26 is reproduced here as amended:

26. A method including
communicating requests and responses between a client and a server;
sending data between said client and said server using a memory access operation involving at least one of plural data buffers of different sizes both in said client and in said server, at least some of said data buffers both in said client and in said server matched to sizes of data blocks to be transferred into or out of said data buffers, wherein selection of one or more of said data buffers is responsive to information in said requests or said responses and is responsive to a size of data blocks for said memory access operation.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 256 at least with respect to “at least some of said data buffers both in said client and in said server matched to sizes of data blocks to be transferred into or out of said data buffers.” Substantially as

discussed above with respect to claim 1, the applied art is not seen to teach this feature. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 26.

Closing

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney can be reached at (614) 486-3585. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Dane C. Butzer
Reg. No. 43,521

Dated: April 14, 2005

Swernofsky Law Group PC
P.O. Box 390013
Mountain View, CA 94039-0013
(650) 947-0700